



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/003,509	11/01/2001	William E. Hertling	100110598-1	9749

7590 03/02/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

TANG, KAREN C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2151

DATE MAILED: 03/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/003,509

Applicant(s)

HERTLING ET AL.

Examiner

Karen C. Tang

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 2151

- A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/09/05 has been entered.
- Claims 1-50 are presented for further examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis (US 6,553,410) in view of Brouk et al hereinafter Brouk (US 2003/0053459) in further view of Stuart (US 6,466,935).

1. Referring to Claims 1, 11, and 31 Kikinis disclosed a method of establishing an interface for a user system between a remote service that does not have a user interface and a remote application comprising:

receiving a file by the application from the user system wherein the file contains standardized interface data (refer to Col 10, Lines 60-67 and Col 11, Lines 1-38);

Art Unit: 2151

sending the file from the application to the service (refer to Col 11);  
generating a return file by the service, wherein the return file contains standardized interface data (refer to Col 11, Lines 35-67, Col 12, Lines 1-27);  
sending the return file to the application (refer to Col 11, Lines 20-50)  
with a dynamic user interface specification (refer to Col 11, Lines 20-67)  
using the dynamic user interface specification to generate a graphic user interface by the application (refer to Col 11, Lines 56-67); and  
creating communication between the service that does not have a graphic user interface and the user by providing the return file (refer to Col 24, Lines 40-67 and Col 25 and Col 26)  
Kikinis did not expressly indicate containing explanatory error messages regarding graphics in the file;

Brouk taught explanatory error messages regarding graphics in the file (refer to 0052, and 0064);

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Kikinis and Brouk's invention due to the fact that both of them indicates the usage of transferring information from source to destination and methods of converting files so the receiving end can understand the information.

The suggestion/motivation would have been that Kikinis indicates "many of the unique functions, are software enable and can be programming in widely variant ways" Utilizing XSLT to convert information are one of many ways to converting data format from one to the other. It would be easier to utilizing the XSLT rather than having programmer to write templates to convert one format to the other to save time and resources.

Art Unit: 2151

Kikinis did not expressly indicate using extensible style language transformation (XSLT) to convert any multi-part Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (MIME) encoding of the dynamic user interface into extensible mark-up language (XML) encoding; and

Brouk disclosed using extensible style language transformation (XSLT) to convert any multi-part Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (MIME) encoding of the dynamic user interface into extensible mark-up language (XML) encoding (refer to Col 0130, 0131 and 0057);

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Kikinis and Brouk's invention due to the fact that both of them indicates the usage of transferring information from source to destination and methods of converting files so the receiving end can understand the information.

The suggestion/motivation would have been that Kikinis indicates "many of the unique functions, are software enable and can be programming in widely variant ways" Utilizing XSLT to convert information are one of many ways to converting data format from one to the other. It would be easier to utilizing the XSLT rather than having programmer to write templates to convert one format to the other to save time and resources.

Neither Kikinis nor Brouk disclosed determining whether the remote application is missing required fonts related to the error messages and listing the required missing fonts; and graphically indicates the missing fonts related to the error messages.

Stuart disclosed determining whether the remote application is missing required fonts related to the error messages and listing the required missing fonts and graphically indicates the missing fonts related to the error messages (refer to Col 9, 50-67);

Art Unit: 2151

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Kikinis, Brouks and Stuart due to the fact that the inventions is to transfer information and control the information from source to destination.

The suggestion/motivation would have been that “many of the unique functions, .are software enable and can be programming in widely variant ways” and by utilizing the software to produce an error indicating graphical box for a missing fonts so the user can produce the appropriate actions.

2. Referring to Claim 2, Kikinis disclosed the method of establishing an interface between a service (Proxy-Server 19, refer to Fig 3 and 4) and an application (NanoBrowser, refer to Col 10, Lines 1-10) wherein the return file (refer to Col 11, Lines 35-67, Col 12, Lines 1-27) is presented as a browser interface (refer to 107, Fig 4).

3. Referring to Claims 3, 33 and 43, Kikinis disclosed the method of establishing an interface (refer to 103, Fig 4) between a service (Proxy-Server 19, refer to Fig 3 and 4) and an application (NanoBrowser, refer to Col 10, Lines 1-10) of claim 1 further comprising: generating a dynamic user interface (session script, refer to Fig 3 and 4, Col 9, Lines 65-67) specification by the service (Proxy-Server 19, refer to Fig 3 and 4), providing the dynamic user interface specification to application (NanoBrowser, refer to Col 10, Lines 1-10); generating a user interface response by the application (refer to Col 10, Lines 6-67); and providing the user interface response to the service (refer to Col 10, Lines 6-67).

Art Unit: 2151

4. Referring to Claim 4, Kikinis disclosed the method of establishing an interface (Other Activity, refer to Col 10, Lines 20-30) between a service (Proxy-Server 19, refer to Fig 3 and 4) and an application (NanoBrowser, refer to Col 10, Lines 1-10) of claim 3 wherein the return file (response and form a necessary interface, interface is a form of files, refer to Col 10, Lines 30-35) is presented as a browser interface.

5. Referring to Claim 5, Kikinis disclosed the method of establishing an interface (refer to Col 10, Lines 30-35) between a service (Proxy-Server 19, refer to Fig 3 and 4) and an application (NanoBrowser, refer to Col 10, Lines 1-10) of claim 3 wherein the user system (Hand Held Field Unit 13, refer to Fig 4) determines content of the user interface response (refer to Col 10, Lines 10-67).

6. Referring to Claim 6, Kikinis disclosed the method of establishing an interface (refer to Col 10, Lines 30-35) between a service (Proxy-Server 19, refer to Fig 3 and 4) and an application (NanoBrowser, refer to Col 10, Lines 1-10) of claim 5 wherein the return file (refer to Col 11, Lines 35-67, Col 12, Lines 1-27) is presented as a browser interface.

7. Referring to Claim 7, Kikinis disclosed the method of establishing an interface (refer to Col 10, Lines 30-35) between a service (Proxy-Server 19, refer to Fig 3 and 4) and application (NanoBrowser, refer to Col 10, Lines 1-10) of claim 3 wherein the user interface specification (session script, refer to Fig 3 and 4, Col 9, Lines 65-67) and user interface response (refer to Col 10, Lines 30-35) are written in a markup language (refer to Col 4, Lines 15-25).

8. Referring to Claim 8, Kikinis disclosed the method of establishing an interface (refer to Col 10, Lines 30-35) between a service (Proxy-Server 19, refer to Fig 3 and 4) and application (NanoBrowser, refer to Col 10, Lines 1-10) of claim 4 wherein the user interface specification (session script, refer to Fig 3 and 4, Col 9, Lines 65-67) and user interface response (refer to Col 10, Lines 30-35) are written in a markup language (refer to Col 4, Lines 15-25).

9. Referring to Claim 9, Kikinis disclosed an interface (refer to Col 10, Lines 30-35) between a service (Proxy-Server 19, refer to Fig 3 and 4) and application (NanoBrowser, refer to Col 10, Lines 1-10) of claim 5 wherein the user interface specification (session script, refer to Fig 3 and 4, Col 9, Lines 65-67) and user interface response (refer to Col 10, Lines 30-35) are written in a markup language (refer to Col 4, Lines 15-25).

10. Referring to Claim 10, Kikinis disclosed an interface (refer to Col 10, Lines 30-35) between a service (Proxy-Server 19, refer to Fig 3 and 4) and application (NanoBrowser, refer to Col 10, Lines 1-10) of claim 6 wherein the user interface specification (session script, refer to Fig 3 and 4, Col 9, Lines 65-67) and user interface response (refer to Col 10, Lines 30-35) are written in a markup language (refer to Col 4, Lines 15-25).

11. Referring to Claim 12, Kikinis disclosed the system for establishing an interface (refer to Col 10, Lines 30-35) of claim 11 wherein the return file (response and form a necessary interface, interface is a form of files, refer to Col 10, Lines 30-35) is presented as a browser interface.



12. Referring to Claim 13, Kikinis disclosed the system for establishing an interface (refer to Col 10, Lines 30-35) of claim 11 further comprised of: a dynamic user interface specification (session script, refer to Fig 3 and 4, Col 9, Lines 65-67) generated by the service (Proxy-Server 19, refer to Fig 3 and 4), wherein the dynamic user interface specification is provided to the application; and a user interface response (refer to Col 10, Lines 30-35) generated by the application; wherein the user interface response is provided to the service (refer to 89, 91, 97, 99, 101, 103, 107, and 109, Fig 4).

13. Referring to Claim 14, Kikinis disclosed an interface (refer to Col 10, Lines 30-35) wherein the return file (response and form a necessary interface, interface is a form of files, refer to Col 10, Lines 30-35) is presented as a browser interface.

14. Referring to Claim 15, Kikinis disclosed an interface (refer to Col 10, Lines 30-35) wherein the user system (Hand Held Field Unit 13, refer to Fig 4) determines content of the user interface response (refer to Col 10, Lines 10-67).

15. Referring to Claim 16, Kikinis disclosed the system (13, refer to Fig 2) for establishing an interface (refer to Col 10, Lines 30-35) wherein the return file (response and form a necessary interface, interface is a form of files, refer to Col 10, Lines 30-35) is presented as a browser interface.

Art Unit: 2151

16. Referring to Claim 17, Kikinis disclosed the system (Hand Held Field Unit 13, refer to Fig 4) for establishing an interface (refer to Col 10, Lines 30-35) of claim of claim 13 wherein the user interface specification (session script, refer to Fig 3 and 4, Col 9, Lines 65-67) and user interface response (refer to Col 10, Lines 10-67) are written in a markup language (refer to Col 4, Lines 15-25).

17. Referring to Claim 18, Kikinis disclosed the system (Hand Held Field Unit 13, refer to Fig 4) for establishing an interface (refer to Col 10, Lines 30-35) of claim of claim 14 wherein the user interface specification (session script, refer to Fig 3 and 4, Col 9, Lines 65-67) and user interface response (refer to Col 10, Lines 10-67) are written in a markup language (refer to Col 4, Lines 15-25).

18. Referring to Claim 19, Kikinis disclosed the system (Hand Held Field Unit 13, refer to Fig 4) for establishing an interface (refer to Col 10, Lines 30-35) of claim of claim 15 wherein the user interface specification (session script, refer to Fig 3 and 4, Col 9, Lines 65-67) and user interface response (refer to Col 10, Lines 10-67) are written in a markup language (refer to Col 4, Lines 15-25).

19. Referring to Claim 20, Kikinis disclosed the system (Hand Held Field Unit 13, refer to Fig 4) for establishing an interface (refer to Col 10, Lines 30-35) of claim of claim 16 wherein the user interface specification (session script, refer to Fig 3 and 4, Col 9, Lines 65-67) and user interface

Art Unit: 2151

response (refer to Col 10, Lines 10-67) are written in a markup language (refer to Col 4, Lines 15-25).

20. Referring to Claims 21 and 41, Kikinis disclosed a computer system comprising: a processor (25, Fig 2); a computer (13, refer to Fig 4, PDA is a form of computer); computer readable medium (17 and 35, it is inherent that modem consist of IP address which is configurable/coded with user's needs, refer to Col 6, Lines 25-55) coupled to the processor; and computer code encoded in the computer readable medium, configured to cause the processor to:

receive a file by the application from a user system, wherein the file contains standardized interface data (refer to Col 10, Lines 60-67 and Col 11, Lines 1-38); provide the file to a service that does not have a graphical user interface (refer to Col 26 and Lines 50-67);

generate a return file by the service, wherein the return file contains standardized interface data refer to Col 11, Lines 35-67, Col 12, Lines 1-27;

provide the return file to the application (refer to Col 11, Lines 20-50); and provide the return file to the user system (refer to Col 11, Lines 20-50).

with a dynamic user interface specification (refer to Col 11, Lines 20-67)

using the dynamic user interface specification to generate a graphic user interface by the application (refer to Col 11, Lines 56-67); and

creating communication between the service that does not have a graphic user interface and the user by providing the return file (refer to Col 24, Lines 40-67 and Col 25 and Col 26)

Kikinis did not expressly indicate containing explanatory error messages regarding graphics in the file;

Art Unit: 2151

Brouk taught explanatory error messages regarding graphics in the file (refer to 0052, and 0064);

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Kikinis and Brouk's invention due to the fact that both of them indicates the usage of transferring information from source to destination and methods of converting files so the receiving end can understand the information.

The suggestion/motivation would have been that Kikinis indicates "many of the unique functions, are software enable and can be programming in widely variant ways" Utilizing XSLT to convert information are one of many ways to converting data format from one to the other. It would be easier to utilizing the XSLT rather than having programmer to write templates to convert one format to the other to save time and resources.

Kikinis did not expressly indicate using extensible style language transformation (XSLT) to convert any multi-part Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (MIME) encoding of the dynamic user interface into extensible mark-up language (XML) encoding; and

Brouk disclosed using extensible style language transformation (XSLT) to convert any multi-part Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (MIME) encoding of the dynamic user interface into extensible mark-up language (XML) encoding (refer to Col 0130, 0131 and 0057);

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Kikinis and Brouk's invention due to the fact that both of them indicates the usage of transferring information from source to destination and methods of converting files so the receiving end can understand the information.

The suggestion/motivation would have been that Kikinis indicates "many of the unique functions, are software enable and can be programming in widely variant ways" Utilizing XSLT

to convert information are one of many ways to converting data format from one to the other. It would be easier to utilizing the XSLT rather than having programmer to write templates to convert one format to the other to save time and resources.

Neither Kikinis nor Brouk disclosed determining whether the remote application is missing required fonts related to the error messages and listing the required missing fonts; and graphically indicates the missing fonts related to the error messages.

Stuart disclosed determining whether the remote application is missing required fonts related to the error messages and listing the required missing fonts and graphically indicates the missing fonts related to the error messages (refer to Col 9, 50-67);

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Kikinis, Brouks and Stuart due to the fact that the inventions is to transfer information and control the information from source to destination.

The suggestion/motivation would have been that “many of the unique functions, are software enable and can be programming in widely variant ways” and by utilizing the software to produce an error indicating graphical box for a missing fonts so the user can produce the appropriate actions.

21. Referring to Claim 22, Kikinis disclosed wherein the return file (response and form a necessary interface, interface is a form of files, refer to Col 10, Lines 30-35) is presented as a browser interface.

Art Unit: 2151

22. Referring to Claim 23, Kikinis disclosed the computer system (Hand Held Field Unit 13, refer to Fig 4) wherein the processor (25, Fig 2) further: generates a dynamic user interface specification (session script, refer to Fig 3 and 4, Col 9, Lines 65-67) by the service (Proxy-Server 19, refer to Fig 3 and 4); provides the dynamic user interface specification to application (NanoBrowser, refer to Col 10, Lines 1-10); generates a user interface response by the application (refer to Col 10, Lines 6-67); and provides the user interface response to the service (refer to Col 10, Lines 6-67).

23. Referring to Claim 24, Kikinis disclosed wherein the configurations file (session script, refer to Fig 3 and 4, Col 9, Lines 65-67) is written in an extensible markup language (refer to Col 4, Lines 15-25).

24. Referring to Claim 25, Kikinis disclosed wherein the user system (Hand Held Field Unit 13, refer to Fig 4)) determines content (menu selection which lead to different set of display) of the user interface response (refer to Col 10, Lines 10-67).

25. Referring to Claim 26, Kikinis disclosed wherein the return file (response and form a necessary interface, interface is a form of files, refer to Col 10, Lines 30-35) is presented as a browser interface.

26. Referring to Claim 27, Kikinis disclosed the computer system (Hand Held Field Unit 13, refer to Fig 4) of claim 23 wherein the user interface specification (session script, refer to Fig 3

Art Unit: 2151

and 4, Col 9, Lines 65-67) and user interface response (refer to Col 10, Lines 10-67) are written in a markup language (refer to Col 4, Lines 15-25).

27. Referring to Claim 28, Kikinis disclosed the computer system (Hand Held Field Unit 13, refer to Fig 4) of claim 23 wherein the user interface specification (session script, refer to Fig 3 and 4, Col 9, Lines 65-67) and user interface response (refer to Col 10, Lines 10-67) are written in a markup language (refer to Col 4, Lines 15-25).

28. Referring to Claim 29, Kikinis disclosed the computer system (Hand Held Field Unit 13, refer to Fig 4) of claim 23 wherein the user interface specification (session script, refer to Fig 3 and 4, Col 9, Lines 65-67) and user interface response (refer to Col 10, Lines 10-67) are written in a markup language (refer to Col 4, Lines 15-25).

29. Referring to Claim 30, Kikinis disclosed the computer system (Hand Held Field Unit 13, refer to Fig 4) of claim 23 wherein the user interface specification (session script, refer to Fig 3 and 4, Col 9, Lines 65-67) and user interface response (refer to Col 10, Lines 10-67) are written in a markup language (refer to Col 4, Lines 15-25).

30. Referring to Claim 32, Kikinis disclosed wherein the return file (response and form a necessary interface, interface is a form of files, refer to Col 10, Lines 30-35) is presented as a browser interface.

Art Unit: 2151

31. Referring to Claim 34, Kikinis disclosed wherein the return file (response and form a necessary interface, interface is a form of files, refer to Col 10, Lines 30-35) is presented as a browser interface.

32. Referring to Claim 35, Kikinis disclosed wherein the user system (Hand Held Field Unit 13, refer to Fig 4)) determines content (menu selection which lead to different set of display) of the user interface response (refer to Col 10, Lines 10-67).

33. Referring to Claim 36, Kikinis disclosed wherein the return file (response and form a necessary interface, interface is a form of files, refer to Col 10, Lines 30-35) is presented as a browser interface.

34. Referring to Claim 37, Kikinis disclosed the computer system (Hand Held Field Unit 13, refer to Fig 4) of claim 23 wherein the user interface specification (session script, refer to Fig 3 and 4, Col 9, Lines 65-67) and user interface response (refer to Col 10, Lines 10-67) are written in a markup language (refer to Col 4, Lines 15-25).

35. Referring to Claim 38, Kikinis disclosed the computer system (Hand Held Field Unit 13, refer to Fig 4) of claim 23 wherein the user interface specification (session script, refer to Fig 3 and 4, Col 9, Lines 65-67) and user interface response (refer to Col 10, Lines 10-67) are written in a markup language (refer to Col 4, Lines 15-25).



Art Unit: 2151

36. Referring to Claim 39, Kikinis disclosed the computer system (Hand Held Field Unit 13, refer to Fig 4) of claim 23 wherein the user interface specification (session script, refer to Fig 3 and 4, Col 9, Lines 65-67) and user interface response (refer to Col 10, Lines 10-67) are written in a markup language (refer to Col 4, Lines 15-25).

37. Referring to Claim 40, Kikinis disclosed the computer system (Hand Held Field Unit 13, refer to Fig 4) of claim 23 wherein the user interface specification (session script, refer to Fig 3 and 4, Col 9, Lines 65-67) and user interface response (refer to Col 10, Lines 10-67) are written in a markup language (refer to Col 4, Lines 15-25).

38. Referring to Claim 42, Kikinis disclosed wherein the return file (response and form a necessary interface, interface is a form of files, refer to Col 10, Lines 30-35) is presented as a browser interface.

39. Referring to Claim 44, Kikinis disclosed wherein the configurations file (session script, refer to Fig 3 and 4, Col 9, Lines 65-67) is written in an extensible markup language (refer to Col 4, Lines 15-25).

40. Referring to Claim 45, Kikinis disclosed wherein the user system (Hand Held Field Unit 13, refer to Fig 4)) determines content (menu selection which lead to different set of display) of the user interface response (refer to Col 10, Lines 10-67).

Art Unit: 2151

41. Referring to Claim 46, Kikinis disclosed wherein the return file (response and form a necessary interface, interface is a form of files, refer to Col 10, Lines 30-35) is presented as a browser interface.

42. Referring to Claim 47, Kikinis disclosed the computer system (Hand Held Field Unit 13, refer to Fig 4) of claim 23 wherein the user interface specification (session script, refer to Fig 3 and 4, Col 9, Lines 65-67) and user interface response (refer to Col 10, Lines 10-67) are written in a markup language (refer to Col 4, Lines 15-25).

43. Referring to Claim 48, Kikinis disclosed the computer system (Hand Held Field Unit 13, refer to Fig 4) of claim 23 wherein the user i Neither Kikinis nor Brouk disclosed determining whether the remote application is missing required fonts related to the error messages and listing the required missing fonts; and graphically indicates the missing fonts related to the error messages.

Stuart disclosed determining whether the remote application is missing required fonts related to the error messages and listing the required missing fonts and graphically indicates the missing fonts related to the error messages (refer to Col 9, 50-67);

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Kikinis, Brouks and Stuart due to the fact that the inventions is to transfer information and control the information from source to destination.

The suggestion/motivation would have been that “many of the unique functions, are software enable and can be programming in widely variant ways” and by utilizing the software to produce

Art Unit: 2151

an error indicating graphical box for a missing fonts so the user can produce the appropriate actions. interface specification (session script, refer to Fig 3 and 4, Col 9, Lines 65-67) and user interface response (refer to Col 10, Lines 10-67) are written in a markup language (refer to Col 4, Lines 15-25).

44. Referring to Claim 49, Kikinis disclosed the computer system (Hand Held Field Unit 13, refer to Fig 4) of claim 23 wherein the user interface specification (session script, refer to Fig 3 and 4, Col 9, Lines 65-67) and user interface response (refer to Col 10, Lines 10-67) are written in a markup language (refer to Col 4, Lines 15-25).

45. Referring to Claim 50, Kikinis disclosed the computer system (Hand Held Field Unit 13, refer to Fig 4) of claim 23 wherein the user interface specification (session script, refer to Fig 3 and 4, Col 9, Lines 65-67) and user interface response (refer to Col 10, Lines 10-67) are written in a markup language (refer to Col 4, Lines 15-25).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 12/09/05 with claims 1- 50 have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

Art Unit: 2151

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karen C. Tang whose telephone number is (571)272-3116. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7 - 3.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571)272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KT  
Karen Tang  
02/21/06

  
ZARNI MAUNG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER